# Draft Individual Review Form

**Proposal number: 2001-I211-2**                **Short Proposal Title: Bay Delta  Learning Initiative**

## 1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

The problem and the audiences are clearly defined.  The problem statement, hypotheses, and objectives mesh with the target audiences.

The objectives are clearly stated and seem to be quite appropriate.

This proposal includes several different problem statements and audiences.  The rational for the selection of these elements is clearly worded and seems highly appropriate.     The different elements include:  Non-invasive species posters to help boaters understand their role in reducing harmful species in the Bay/Delta; Journalist Tour to help the media understand key issues when reporting on Bay Delta stories; and Teaching Workshops to assist underserved youth in understanding the complex world of the Bay Delta issues.

## 1b1) Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Each of the project components including Non-invasive Species Posters, Journalist Tour and Bay-Delta Briefings ,  and Teaching Tools/Workshops include a carefully crafted model and explains the rational for each step.  The model for the non-invasive species posters included: research into what had been done previously, project completion steps, evaluation, and distribution.  Journalist tour includes the need for such a tour, overview of tour, and publicity for tour.  The teaching tools section included the need for sharing these tools with a wider audience, organization and how these workshops will be conducted, and cooperative ventures with other organizations and curriculums

This section is well-written, complete and defines the basis for the proposed work.

## 1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

The approach is well designed and very appropriate for meeting the objectives.  Each of the elements has been selected to resolve problems with people's understanding of the need for increased Bay-Delta water quality concerns.  The approaches are well designed for meeting each target audience profiles.

## 1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

The criteria is not applicable for an environmental education grant proposal although it could fall into the demonstration project or implementation project.

**1c2) Is the project likely to generate information that can be used to inform future decision making?**
Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

The evaluations of each of these projects is likely to lead to increased awareness by boaters, media, and teachers of the importance of a healthy Bay Delta Watershed and will likely lead to more positive decisions about their role in enhancing the health of the watershed.    Both media and teachers have a role in sharing this information with many other recipients, thus it has a multiplier effect.

**2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project?**
Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

A thorough evaluation program is explained and seems quite appropriate for the objectives.

**2b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives?**
Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Although this criteria would be more appropriate for a research project, the evaluation components as mentioned above seem adequate to meet the objectives.

**3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible?**
Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes, the proposed work seems technically feasible.

**4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project?**
Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes, the team seems qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the project.  They do document some of their previous accomplishments.

**Miscellaneous comments**
[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

I thought this was a well reasoned, planned approach that does look at resolving some problems with Bay Delta information and awareness.  It is targeted to appropriate audiences and has a feasible time line.  The amount of funding seems to be in line with the problems it attempts to resolve.  I would recommend funding this proposal.

| **Overall Evaluation** Statement **Summary Rating** | **Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating –** See Above |
|---|---|
| ☐ Excellent **XXX**<br>☐ Very Good<br>☐ Good<br>☐ Fair<br>☐ Poor | [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field] |